

## **ALAN WATT    BLURB (i.e. Educational Talk):**

### **"Great Britain, Embryo of World Government - 1938 Report from Royal Institute of International Affairs' Global Meeting"**

**May 4, 2007**

**Dialogue Copyrighted Alan Watt - May 4, 2007  
(Exempting Music and Literary Quotes)**

**[WWW.CUTTINGTHROUGHTHEMATRIX.COM](http://WWW.CUTTINGTHROUGHTHEMATRIX.COM)**

**[alanwattsentientsentinel.eu](http://alanwattsentientsentinel.eu)**

Hi folks, I'm Alan Watt. It is May 4<sup>th</sup>, 2007 at [cuttingthroughthematrix.com](http://cuttingthroughthematrix.com) and [alanwattsentientsentinel.eu](http://alanwattsentientsentinel.eu)

People have asked me about some of the older books I have collected over the years, which were published and made available to the public. Some of them were even put into public libraries, but the mainstream media never made much of them. They didn't mention them, because the mainstream media's job is to make you think about things, which your betters have decided that you should think about, and they tell you all that they've decided you need to know. Legally, those who plan your lives in such an intricate spider-web, interconnecting way, are so legalistic they do allow their books to be put out into the hands of the public. Many of them are published, not all of them, obviously, because so much is still - and always will be - classified as top secret, and comes under "security". Under the guise of security, they can keep everything stamped and put away in vaults, for as long as they wish to.

This is an ongoing process. Even after the main NAFTA, or Free Trade negotiations (the actual free trade negotiations was a pre-cursor of NAFTA - it was the major setting up of the unification for the Americas), only an actual edited report was given and made available to the public. The rest was sealed and not for public consumption, and put in a vault outside Ottawa where it'll stay for 30-50 years. We don't live in a society of freedom. That's the illusion that we're given from television. They keep telling you you're so free - you live in the freest countries in the world. That's all part of the illusion creation. The more they say it, the more people believe it, and when you show them something that's not on the mainstream media, they disbelieve it. They truly have been trained, like Zbigniew Brzezinski said, to let the media do their reasoning and their thinking for them. That's happened with most people. You can't blame the people, since the indoctrination technique starts at birth and continues throughout your whole life.

One of the various books I have, was taken from the Royal Institute of

International Affairs world meeting, one of their world meetings. This particular one, the topic was the British Commonwealth and the future. It was published by Humphrey Milford, and this was 1938. I think the meeting was 1937. However, at the beginning of the book it says:

*"Issued under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, the Canadian Institute of International Affairs, the Australian Institute of International Affairs, the New Zealand Institute of International Affairs, the South African Institute of International Affairs and the Indian Institute of International Affairs, for India."*

**Alan:** There are more now, and all the non-Commonwealth countries now, after '45, are called Council on Foreign Relations, such as the one in the U.S. Underneath those listed, it says:

*"The Institute of International Affairs in the British Commonwealth are precluded by their rules from expressing as institutes, an opinion on any aspect of international or imperial affairs. Any opinions expressed in this book are therefore not those of the institutes."*

**Alan:** It's a disclaimer. They're quite right, because they don't talk about politics. They simply have a plan, which is world government. Politics is a lower show for the public to believe in - the Punch and Judy show that they used to show in the Middle Ages, going around the villages. I think this book, initially, was funded by the Rockefeller Foundation.

It has all the minutes of the meetings. It's got all the lists of all the members in the back, who they are (there's hundreds and hundreds of them), politicians from all countries as well and even labour unions. Carroll Quigley said, who was the historian for the Council on Foreign Relations for a while, he said that we (that means the institute) have no problems conversing and working with communists, capitalists, dictators and so on, and frequently do so. They do, because they're all part of it, you see, at the top.

The whole idea of this dominion, this political commonwealth they had of Britain, was set up not just to be a commonwealth, but also to eventually bring in other countries. They knew they had to change the name of their organisation, eventually creating the League of Nations. The League of Nations was funded into existence by the British government, even though the United States put capital in, as well, and pretended not to take part in it, after Wilson. They did take part in it; they had so-called "unofficial members" at every meeting.

The League of Nations was to be the embryo - based on the British system - of world government. They knew that they'd have a hard task, a very hard task to convince the populace of the world to accept it. They had to get a different name. It couldn't be allied to Britain, or the United States, or any of the colonial powers, so they had to give it a new name, under the guise of a knight in shining armour. It's a trick that's been used down through the centuries. It was definitely set up to be the embryo of world government, based on the British system of free trade, and inter-dependence - a concept going back to John Dee, who first coined the term British, or "Brytish Empire", and proposed

this system to Queen Elizabeth I of a world empire. To sell the idea of a world empire, you must bring in all leaders from all groups, and when you don't have enough groups to give it some sort of public official backing, then you create the groups that speak on the public's behalf. You always make sure that you put in the leader - an old technique. At these meetings, anyone who was anyone in decision-making in the country, any country, was present. From left-ring, right-wing, far-left, far-right, and up and down - they all belonged to it, dictators, too.

Britain and the empire was to be the basis for a League of Nations, which was to transform with more power after a period of time, into the United Nations - mainly to convince the public in a long-term plan, that they must give up not just their national identity, but they must adopt a new culture which would be made for them, for a world system. The world system that others working for the British government and the British aristocracy at that time, like Bertrand Russell, called "a world run by experts". It had to be sold to the public, mainly, as helping the public. That's how you do it; you create a mouse-trap as they say in commerce, and allow the mouse to come in, then you grab them, and you use them for the real reason. That's how this system works. In other words, the people are the last ones to know the real purposes behind it. We're told all the good stuff, to get you in to the mouse-trap.

In this book it says on page 258, it's under the title "A World Order":

*"Several delegates, more especially from the left political wing, urged that no world order could be built, save on a better social order. A world order, said one, implies a rule of justice, internal as well as international, social as well as political."*

**Alan:** He then went on to espouse the fact they would use the labour standards of Britain, to bring the working people on board, basically, to co-operate towards this order. Just above this on the same page, 258, it states here:

*"More than one delegate remarked that once the commonwealth basis was achieved, there was no reason why the control should not be international, and many reasons why it should. And the members of the conference were brought back to their conceptions of a world order, by the question 'how can you get international control without international government?'"*

**Alan:** Well, you see, they knew ultimately, it would evolve into international government.

In page 278, it goes on to say:

*"The commonwealth order, we may surmise, is only a path to a world order. The conference discussion suggested that this gradual assimilation might happen in economic as well as the political sphere. Whether the commonwealth would then continue or pass away as having fulfilled its usefulness, would be for some British Commonwealth relations conference of the future to discuss."*

**Alan:** This was based, as well, remember, the Council on Foreign Relations

and the Royal Institute of International Affairs, on another group, which had been born in the 1800's, the Cecil Rhodes Society, and Foundation, given a Royal Charter to exist. They were, in effect, a front group, technically non-governmental, so they could get away with doing a lot in the world, without governments being blamed as backing them. Lord Milner, Alfred Milner, joined the Round Table societies with the Rhodes Foundation, and this made the nucleus for the League of Nations, which is the United Nations, and you still have the Round Table societies working on different problems, like think-tanks do, on how to make us all inter-dependent.

On page 260 it says:

*"There did not appear however, to be any dissent from one proposition; that an eventual world order involved an encroachment on national sovereignty, and that this must be a slow and difficult business. Here was a highly important point in connection with the future of the commonwealth itself. For if the effort towards a world order is one of the unifying factors of the commonwealth, and if complete national sovereignty is antipathetic to a world order, then complete national sovereignty cannot be more than a transitional phase of commonwealth relations themselves. The essence of a true league was put to the conference, is that no member has the right of neutrality. One speaker, himself a strong believer in the domain's right to neutrality, said plainly, that a real league must mean a super-state."*

**Alan:** He's talking about world government.

*"A delegate referred in an expressive phrase to a society of independent, inter-dependent states, among which, he said, association for mutual defence was quite possible. A similar phrase was indeed used of the British Commonwealth itself."*

**Alan:** On page 261 they discuss the following:

*"Several delegates felt the problem of a world order to be intimately bound up with that of strengthening the friendly relations, which all agreed to be necessary between the nations of the British Commonwealth and the United States. A Canadian spoke of the paradox that while participation in collective security was impossible for the United States, her collaboration was more easily achieved, and her suspicion of British policy less acute, when the latter was directed to upholding the principle of collective security and a world order. One of those who would identify the steps towards a world order, with a leaguings of the democratic states against dictatorships, remarked that the United States and the commonwealth had a great common interest in the fact that the NAZI philosophy was death to them both."*

**Alan:** Remember that war wasn't declared by that time. It was pre-World War II.

*"A delegate with very different political ideas pointed out that American suspicions towards Great Britain and France, was nothing to American aversion towards dictatorship states. While some delegates drew attention to the growing participation of the United States in international organisation*

and action, a Canadian member of the conference argued that the breakdown of the political side of the league had made American participation in a revived league less likely, and that the way back was through a co-operative league, linking up different regional leagues of a very similar character, including no doubt the Pan-American union."

**Alan:** 1938, hmm.

*"A world order, as United Kingdom delegates pointed out, will not wash out their diversities and perhaps regional co-operation may be the means of finding unity in diversity."--*

**Alan:** You've heard that phrase before, "unity in diversity". That's a con game that's been sold to all the countries that joined the European Union, and now will be sold to the public as we're being merged into the American Union.

*"'I'm not interested in world unity,' said the same delegate, 'I just want enough unity to provide the good life.'"*

**Alan:** That's a term that Huxley and others used, and Bertrand Russell.

*"This same idea was presumably in the mind of the delegate who claimed, a lonely voice, the world order was a false objective. The present regional groupings of powers was much more natural than any attempt at universality."*

**Alan:** So these guys were the ones who called "regions" parts of the planet. They'd already mapped out the planet into regions. Regions, interestingly enough, is also taken from Masonic terms. They have their areas, which they call "regions," as well, because all these guys were members of Knights Templars, and various other Masonic organisations, both left-wing, right-wing, and up and down.

On page 223: the opening speaker on the chapter of "The Future of the Commonwealth as a Co-operative Organisation." Interestingly, the report was made by Professor Sir Alfred Zimmerman, commission recorder. Alfred Zimmerman was the kind of right-hand man around Winston Churchill. Alfred Zimmerman also was the head of the Communist Party in Britain at one time, and was the publisher of its main newspaper. We're told that Winston Churchill hated communists, and here he is with this character hanging round his neck, and he confided in him with complete trust, because there's no war at the top, you see, never was. This is the recorder, basically, for this part of the talk.

They go into again, with the world order, and mention the Balfour report of 1926. He says:

*"He considered that his conclusions were all contained in the Balfour report of 1926, which was, after all, the basis of the present position. He went on to say that there was an impression in the dominions that the statute of Westminster was given grudgingly."--*

**Alan:** Given grudgingly. That's a statute, another thing that should be read

up by people.

*"Nothing could be further from the truth, as he was able to say from personal knowledge."*

**Alan:** Down at the bottom of page 223 it says:

*"A fifth Canadian speaker mentioned this. He could conceive a situation arising in which a dominion might be involved in a war without involving other parts, for instance, a conflict between Japan and the United States, in which Canada might be involved."*

**Alan:** Remember, this was before World War II, before Pearl Harbour.

On page 221 it says:

*"This conception of the commonwealth as the nucleus of a system of world government was discussed from various angles, both in the session of that morning, and at the two subsequent meetings of the commission."*

**Alan:** So, there you are, the British Commonwealth was to be the nucleus of a world government. They created the League of Nations, transforming into the United Nations. Remember that every major media mogul on the planet attended this particular, and other meetings that they have, because they are your propagandists to train people inter-generationally towards global government - *their* global government. Many people, I'm sure, will see this as quite a natural development, and a thing to work towards, if they believe the real reasons, or wars as they're given in history books, were caused by the reasons they tell you. You're looking at the top tycoons on the planet, whose beginnings go back to the old knights, when they looted countries. Then they created corporations, like the British East India Company, who set up all of this.

They get all the true believers working for them, towards global government, when they will have a little twist in the tail towards the end of it, for the real reason. We know what the real reason's going to be, and luckily we get quips of that from other players from the aristocracy, like Bertrand Russell, and like [Charles] Galton Darwin.

It goes through on other pages, the plans for Australia, including immigration policies that would take a while to introduce, as they conditioned the public to accept what, at that time, were the non-white immigrants in. They would start taking them in slowly, over a long period of time, from India, and then even Arabic countries. 1938. They even had the setting up of the west coast of Canada for Chinese immigrants, because they knew at the time, eventually, they were going to set up China. It's mentioned in this book too, that China would eventually become a big economic power. They knew it because they'd already had guys like Bertrand Russell working in China helping to set up the Communist Party, to create nationalism, which you must create before you create communism, before you have dictatorship, and before you end up having the new way - the third way, as it's called. This is a process. If you read Plato's books and other Greek philosophers' books, they go through the

process from one type of system to the next, as though it's a formula. They say that democracy always ends up in dictatorship.

It should be noted, that at this meeting they talked about setting up sub-regions, which would work quietly but efficiently and be well-funded, towards bringing those regions together, in the same form as the rest of the world would be brought together. Those that would resist more would have a slower time, more propaganda given to them. They'd be tied economically and politically and legally, in such a way that they'd have no option but to go along with this new system. They created the Institute for Pacific Relations - that's a branch of the Royal Institute of International Affairs and the Council on Foreign Relations - to work on the Far East. They created other ones, as well, all weaved together intricately like a big spider's web.

On page 276 it says "The Commonwealth of the Future":

*"The answer to the final question on the conference agenda, whether there emerged from its discussions any new conception of the commonwealth, must in the nature of things remain a personal one. The recorder of the commission for has set down the various thoughts that were contributed to the pool of prophecy and practical political ideas. What follows is a desolation from that pool, but one inevitably flavoured with the personal opinions of the writer. One delegate, with unanswerable realism, said that the future of the commonwealth was going to depend on the outcome of the next European war."*

**Alan:** They knew it was coming, because the Council on Foreign Relations and the Royal Institute of International Affairs, according to [Carroll] Quigley, helped drum up all the propaganda and get the fear going, to get Britain into it. All the top newspaper guys were members. They told the British public lots of lies, had them digging ditches in the streets in the cities, and all wearing gas masks thinking they were going to be gassed. It was all a big lie according to Quigley.

*"Few others however, and not even he himself, were willing to speculate on what that outcome would be if a European war did break out. While the conference was held under the shadow of threatening war in Europe, its discussions of the future of the commonwealth were based on the only assumption on which it was profitable to proceed; that existing trends would either be allowed a period without war in which to work themselves out, or else would prove more potent than even those incalculable new forces which might be set up by a general war. The discussions at the conference inspired in one observer's mind a vision of a future commonwealth, not static but dynamic. To borrow the phrase of an Irish delegate, dynamic within itself through the gradual working out of the principle of self-government, which will steadily increase the number of its own elect,"--*

**Alan:** Interesting, eh? "Its own elect."

*"and gaining dynamic force from without by finding its inspiration in ideals that are broader than itself, and can be brought to fruition only on a world scale. Individual and group freedom based on responsibility, peace as the*

*condition of freedom, that brotherhood of all races, colours and creeds. With its progress on this path, new problems will arise."*

**Alan:** They knew, back then, they were going to integrate and multiculturalise the world. The elite at the top (who really are the bosses) see the peasantry of all peoples as just one big pool of labour. They don't care personally what colour you think you are. They also believed in a system where the individual would serve the world state. **Serve** the world state - that would be your purpose in life. They knew that the progress on this path, new problems would arise, because of conflicts of different cultures coming together. It would take a long period to do, but they thought it could be done. Their dates are pretty well right - the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

*"With its progress on this path, new problems will arise. The multiplication of sovereign states within its circle, as countries not yet right for self-government attain to full nationhood, and those already self-governing assume fresh responsibilities, will give rise to new conundrums in constitutional relations and increase the existing difficulties of constructing uniform and universal machinery for co-operation in foreign policy and defence. Above all, the rise of non-white nations to self-government, allied to the natural course of world events, will drive racial and inter-continental questions more and more to the front of commonwealth problems. New attitudes of mind will become necessary. A discarding, no doubt, of the tacit assumption of which an Indian delegate complained, that the British nations have a divine purpose to fulfill and have more to contribute than other nations to the fund of practical wisdom about race relations. A discarding too, in the phrase of the United Kingdom delegate, of condescension and the attitude of mind on both sides that always suspects something sinister in the other. The multiplication of states within the commonwealth itself suggests the question whether it might not increase in the future, by enrolling new members from outside. The delegates did not tackle in detail the practical problems involved in such a course, believing no doubt with an Irish member that the British nations must go further on their own road before inviting others into their circle. Moreover, many people saw the possible future absorption of foreign countries in a process of assimilation, rather than incorporation. The commonwealth is a miniature world, containing peoples of every colour, and from all continents. As it works out its own destiny, the world of which it is part will be struggling with the same problems on a larger scale. In a phrase used by a member of the conference, at a public gathering, after the conference itself had concluded: the commonwealth should be an example to the world of what it would wish the world to be. Is it too much to imagine that gradually the commonwealth and those parts of the world, which had progressed so far, or further in the art of self-government, will become assimilated? The commonwealth order, we may surmise, is only a path to a world order. The conference discussions suggested that this gradual assimilation might happen in the economic, as well as the political sphere."*

**Alan:** They knew this. This is written rather weakly here. In their other books they go into this in more detail, and all of the different subgroups, which they have - there's hundreds of them actually allied to this. It was massive in its time this organisation, and it's much bigger today. They go on to say that eventually the British Commonwealth would pass away having fulfilled its



usefulness.

In the back of the book they have all the members who attended, from all the countries. It's worth noting, if you want to read some of their books you can get their books - Royal Institute of International Affairs from:

Chatham House  
10 St. James Square  
London  
SW1

I think you also have a branch in New York, for the CFR, and that's the Pratt House or the Pratt Building.

This organisation had all the Fabian leaders in it. It had all the supposed far-right leaders in it. It's all one big club at the top. All the big media moguls attended. They shape the world; they predict the future by making it happen. Having worked out all the problems in advance, they have no problems, with problems, when they crop up. They've foreseen it all, you see, complete integration of the planet.

They go into a world court that would eventually be used for the entire planet. It would start as a sort of criminal court for tyrants, but would blossom into basically the only governmental court on the planet. Old stuff, which has had a long time to plan and work, and market its ideas from thousands of sources to the generations that have grown up since this particular meeting was held - one of many, many, many meetings. There you have that part of it.

The British Commonwealth was set up initially to be a nucleus of world government. They have no problems talking about that. They have no problems admitting the League of Nations, which became the United Nations, was modelled on the system and run by the same guys really, and nothing's changed. Above these groups there are higher groups, the Bilderbergers, the Club of Rome. The Club of Rome deals mainly with depopulation, but by saying the opposite of what they're really all about - a planned society. The Bilderbergers have all the top moguls there. They have future Presidents and Prime Ministers invited to attend - that's why you know they're going to be a Prime Minister or a President. The Queen (or her representatives) attend each meeting, and all the big bankers.

Remember what H.G. Wells said. He said, "We must bring in to this federation those who understand economics," so they brought big bankers in on it. That's why the big banking system, which runs our lives really, had to be brought in. at the top you have an aristocratic elite, who have run the world for a long, long time. They're psychopathic; we know where they're heading to. They have lots of workers working for them below, at conference, where many of them thinking they're working for the betterment of mankind. The ones at the top can't help but give themselves away every so often. When you're planning a controlled society, and when you realise their answer to racial problems, cultural problems and all the rest of it, is to basically engineer new species of humanity, genetically, eventually, to serve them better at the top, then perhaps everyone would stop fighting each other and see who their common

enemy really is. They'll find them in their own peoples at the top. Their own top people (the psychopaths) in this system of money - wealth, which is power in the system - are psychopaths. There's no such thing, as "poor boy leaves ghetto and makes good," like the old Rothschild story. It's a nice little story for the children but it's so far from being true.

So before I put this book down, I'll just read a little bit of the foreword in it. It says:

*"This book is designed to furnish an official report of the second conference on British Commonwealth relations, which was held at Lapstone, near Sydney in September of 1938. The conference was larger in numbers and I think perhaps more representative in character than the Toronto conference of 1933. We of the Australian Institute were deeply gratified that our invitation to hold the conference in Australia was accepted, and still more that so many distinguished men should have joined the various delegations. The holding of the conference in Australia, or at all, was made possible only by the generous assistance we received from the governments of the commonwealth, and of the state of New South Wales, and also from the Carnegie Corporation and the Rhodes,"--*

**Alan:** That's Cecil Rhodes.

*"[Rhodes] trustees. I wish on behalf of the Australian Institute, and on behalf of all the members of the conference, to express our high appreciations of this assistance."*

**Alan:** So here is technically a group, massive, massive, world (laughs) -- it's a mountain, which is funded by the big corporations. That's why the corporation foundations were set up in the first place - to run a world to fund those organisations, which they would either create or take over, to push certain social policies worldwide. They received funding from the commonwealth countries. Interesting, eh, for a non-governmental organisation that plans your future, states quite correctly that it doesn't discuss politics; it doesn't discuss its social proceedings, because it's a plan. It's a plan; it's an agenda. You don't argue about it, it's a plan you see. On the previous page it says "the British Commonwealth and the future proceedings of the second **un**official conference on British Commonwealth relations, Sydney 3<sup>rd</sup> - 17<sup>th</sup> September, 1938." (One of many.)

Another myriad that works for it, is a club called the Empire Club. Anyone who's anyone in a country, in business, will try to become a member. They have again, the members of the Royal Institute of International Affairs and the CFR going around as main speakers, as guests to the commonwealth clubs, and to the various other organisations - this myriad underneath them that controls our lives.

On page 49 of the same book, it has here (this report was made by a Professor Scott):

*"A study group in Victoria B.C. after emphasising the importance of relative standards of living to this question, reached the conclusion that were there no*

*restrictions, British Columbia could and would support a considerably increased population of Asiatic origin."*

**Alan:** The reason for that, was they knew they were setting up China, eventually, in the future, to be a main manufacturer of the planet and they would need the middle-man; an educated class to manage the import and exporting and so on.

Nothing happens by accident you see. Everything's planned so far ahead of time, and people grow up and never know they're living through a long-term business plan. That's the real world we live in. Many of the groups who help bring this to be, thinking they're working for the greater good, they're all being used, because the higher group that runs all sides of everything have already told us what they want to do with us. We see it forming around us, the totalitarian states. We're going to one big global totalitarian prison camp, with a planned future, a depopulation programme, coming from this wonderful egg that came out of the embryo of the League of Nations, now the United Nations. The big stick is starting to come out and we're seeing the force come in. This is to be a very efficiently run world. They decided long ago they would do away with all conflict. They meant **all conflict**, right down to man and woman. They would destroy marriage - it would be obsolete. It's all been, almost, formulated and completed.

We're not dealing with little clubs here that make wish lists and have governmental funding to do so, and meet in exotic far away places. They plan the future. They have the means to implement it, through propaganda, since all your top magazine editors and newspaper men are there, and the internet fellows. They market our culture to us, and upgrade it and keep on upgrading it, just like you upgrade the virus programmes on your computer. That's the real world we live in - a planned society.

Then when you start devaluing life itself, which was a "must be" you see - you can't allow horror for the future, new types of human beings to be created, purpose-made human beings, intelligent design (ID), unless you have become desensitised to what it is to be human in the first place. Everyone has had that through the way the presentations have been marketed to us on abortions, and science with its hype about how wonderful to have all these organs to save lives, and possibly stem-cell research will save us all "down the road." That's always a big carrot for us to go along with it, as they bring more horrors upon us, until we've just dehumanised ourselves. We've lessened our own self-worth when we allow it to be done to others. When they come knocking at your door - who's there to stand up for you?

They say the road to hell is paved with good intentions. That maxim holds true for many of those who help bring about what they think is going to be a utopia for everyone. They are so naive and disbelieving in the fact that there are people who can pretend so well, act so well that they care, at the top of this tree, but who actually want to eliminate a good part of the planet.

Arthur C. Clarke, who I've mentioned a few times, wrote a sort of scenario out in allegorical form of this system, beginning for 2001 to kick it all off big-time, the next big push, 2010, for the completion of most of it. Then he takes you in

his book, his last one; "3001," through a journey into a future where they're down to one billion people on the planet, and even then in the book one of the characters is complaining that's too many. It is a chipped society. It also has the direct thought-to-thought control electronic equipment working, which we know was discussed at Loyola University with a brain implant for control purposes. These guys don't make this stuff up. They're given the facts of the plan and they write stories around them, which fascinate young people. Everyone is fascinated, when they're young, in science-fiction. It's predictive programming so that when it actually comes into being in your lifetime, because it's familiar to you, you accept it without question, as a normal progression.

We are up against pretty well everything that we take for granted. All of the agencies and organisations, which you hear mentioned briefly on little news quips, are non-governmental organisations. Unelected people and representatives from these organisations run your lives, from all sources, mainly from media and marketing. Marketing is one of the biggest tools they must use in conjunction with television and all advertising. They market ideas to us continuously, all the time.

We also have secrecy, under the guise of national and international security, on advanced technologies, therefore the public are never told - never ever told - what they actually have, until 50-80 years later. Then it's obsolete, in fact, when the public get to use to it. They've moved on to much more advanced technology by then. There are three levels of technology in use at all times. There's a professorship down level, who believe everything they're told, and the public believes everything they read in the science magazines - they're just starting to work on something and maybe one day in the future they will be able to, and so on. Then there's the CIA, Mossad, MI6 level, where they have advanced gadgetry. In the 1950's, Nick Begich has shown us they had, the CIA had technology, which could put direct voice to skull information right into the middle of your head, from line of sight, and you could put the gadget in your pocket! It's antique stuff by today's standards. The whole flying saucer scenario covered up the government making the darn things by getting the media to go into action, and even fronting groups to start up the whole alien thing, "well, it must be from aliens, because we don't have them". That's how easy it was to divert attention from black budget projects.

Remember, there's always a good reason given to the public, then there's the real reason, which they're never told about. That's how you manage the public. That's what Francis Bacon, and Machiavelli, and other advisers to kings and queens, talked about. It's best not to let the public know the real purpose behind laws, and institutions, and movements. As I say, you don't want to frighten the children, and that's how we're looked upon. There are too many children, according to them, and we don't have a function any more and we might get unruly in fact, if we don't have enough bread and circuses, like what Mr. Huxley talked about.

They plan to deal with it all, as they bring this world down. As it's uniting, we're going into the horror show, not all happy smiling faces. We're going into economic depressions. Our whole life is to be regulated. All energy resources have been taken from our hands completely. Shortly, it will be

banned, to try and heat yourself to live and survive in a winter, unless you use their designated fuel, and if you have your place inspected to see if it's fit, to use this fuel. This has happened already here in Canada. You'll probably be hung, drawn and quartered if you try and use wood in a wood stove, because you'll be independent of the monetary system - the profit system which keeps you, or will keep you in grinding poverty.

You're going to be taxed for every BTU you use. You're going to pay through the nose for every little Watt of electricity, and you're going to be trained now. The UN says we must be trained, must train the public to cut back and back and back, and as they're training us to cut back, the cost of electricity and all power is to vastly increase. The global plantation is under way. The food resources of the world are out of the public's hands in most countries. What's left for the public is modified by scientists who worked in secret agreements with governments - that's admitted now. These are the same boys who are bringing us in to a lovely world order, where we're supposed to march in with balloons and skipping and hopping, gaily, if you can still use that word gaily, like naïve little children as the Pied Piper leads us to utopia, which is actually Dante's Inferno.

Big shock to people who think their countries have just been taken over now, big shock. Terror, hype, fear to think you've just been taken over. You were *born* in a time when it really was already taken over. In the book I just read, they talked about the pre-cursor and the setting up of a system, which became NATO, which would link and bind and join at the hip Britain, and the United States and Canada, and eventually the rest of Europe. Go into the writings of Karl Marx who wrote his, well it wasn't his Communist Manifesto, he just wrote what he was told. He wrote it in London, and he was sponsored by the big foundations to do so. The richest corporations on the planet funded him to write it. In there, he said, in the 1800s, the world they'd bring into being would consist of three main trading blocks; a united Europe, the united Americas and a Pacific rim area, all with provincial governments. Provinces, you see, under a super world government. If you think it's still all coincidence - go back to dreamland, follow rainbows, you might find a leprechaun at the end of it with a pot of gold - have an outer-body experience, play with your chakras, wish it all better, as we used to tell the children when children skin their knees. "Why don't you wish it all better? Close your eyes and wish it all better." The whole New Age phenomena, has disarmed the minds of millions of people. The circuses, and the sports, have disarmed most of the rest.

They say there's nothing new under the sun. Perhaps so, except for the advance in psychology on a mass scale, coupled with such a mass media, but the techniques are old - that is true - very old techniques that unified ancient cultures. If a monied system had never come into being - you would have, over a vast amount of time, gradual integration of all peoples. Young people, when their hormones work, don't really care what colour someone is, at all. You'd have a natural integration without conflict over a long period of time. It's happened in other countries too. When the Scots came into Scotland, the Picts already lived there, and there's no records of wars. There was inter-marriage and gradually they were assimilated into the Scots. That's happened in many other countries too. It's only when there's money behind it, because they have an imperative of time - running it towards business plans as they do - that they

bring in brute force and force things along, or they use and pay for massive immigration to come in and create conflict. When people come in, in small numbers to any country they gradually blend in, mix, adapt.

The policies of putting people in specific areas in large cities, is a form of ghetto creation to keep them separate. It doesn't help them disperse and integrate into the system. They can always use that conflict when it suits them, and that day will come when they start crashing the monied system. Everyone can get along, just, you see, in crowded cities, as long as the money's flowing for everything. When it starts to get difficult to pay the rent, everyone's worried. Conflicts begin and people start subdividing back into original groups and fighting each other. The big boys count on these kinds of things happening to bring in the brute force for the new system; so don't fight each other. You've got to rise above all of that. Don't let good speakers stir up the emotions to such a pitch that the ordinary folk fight the other ordinary folk, regardless of their colour, creed or whatever. That's what they count on too, you see. When you see the big picture we see, (I see) the populations of the world, facing the same horror show - a non-thinking future for what will be left of what we call humanity, at the lower levels, which is the majority. A state of never being able to say "I think". It will be inconceivable to perceive of yourself as a distinct individual, as we've been told.

The book I quoted from, I'm sure even that was whitewashed to an extent, but it does at least show you all the groups, the left and right, all the people who went back home and claimed they were for the working peoples. The lords were there too, different lords, and they go back there and talk to their own peer group and have a little chuckle how they'd conned the public again, or the people, and how it had them all on board you see, all "on board" and "on track" to the same agenda. Always with the promise of a better carrot at the end of the stick, never fails.

It's been a dry read for me, reading this old book here, yet these are the books you have to plough through, and stay awake, to come to the understanding that it's necessary to not combat this head on as they expect you to, but to go off in a different tangent. The tangent comes with understanding what's really happening. They expect people to lock horns with them. They're masters of the chessboard with two sides. We must find another way, which is not planned by them. You can't play the dialectic with these characters.

From Hamish and myself it's goodnight and may your God, or your Gods, go with you.

## **Working Class Hero**

**by John Lennon**

As soon as you're born they make you feel small  
By giving you no time instead of it all  
Till the pain is so big you feel nothing at all  
A working class hero is something to be

A working class hero is something to be

They hurt you at home and they hit you at school  
They hate you if you're clever and they despise a fool  
Till you're so fucking crazy you can't follow their rules  
A working class hero is something to be  
A working class hero is something to be

When they've tortured and scared you for twenty odd years  
Then they expect you to pick a career  
When you can't really function you're so full of fear  
A working class hero is something to be  
A working class hero is something to be

Keep you doped with religion and sex and TV  
And you think you're so clever and class less and free  
But you're still fucking peasants as far as I can see  
A working class hero is something to be  
A working class hero is something to be

There's room at the top they are telling you still  
But first you must learn how to smile when you kill  
If you want to be like the folks on the hill  
A working class hero is something to be  
A working class hero is something to be  
If you want to be a hero well just follow me  
If you want to be a hero well just follow me.

(Transcribed by Matthew)